UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/575,119	05/16/2006	Charles R Cantor	701586-054202US 7233		
Ronald I Eisen	7590 02/07/2008 stein		EXAM	INER	
Nixon Peabody 100 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110-2131			YU, MISOOK		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2000m, Am 1 02110 2101			1642		
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		1 4 - 11 - 12	1	Anglicant/a			
Office Action Summary		Application N	10.	Applicant(s)			
		10/575,119		CANTOR ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		MISOOK YU		1642			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHICHEVER IS - Extensions of time ma after SIX (6) MONTHS - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the Office later than three months after the mailing dijustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS 36(a). In no event, h will apply and will ex a. cause the application	COMMUNICATION nowever, may a reply be timpire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) Responsive	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2007.						
2a)☐ This action	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claim	ns						
4a) Of the a 5)	21 is/are pending in the application above claim(s) is/are withdrawis/are allowed is/are rejected is/are objected to is/are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consi					
Application Papers							
	cation is objected to by the Examine		objected to by the	Examiner			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119						
a)	gment is made of a claim for foreign Some * c) None of: tified copies of the priority documentified copies of the priority documenties of the certified copies of the priority documentication from the International Bureatched detailed Office action for a list	nts have been ints have been ints have been into ority document au (PCT Rule 1	received. received in Applicat is have been receiv 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of Reference 2) Notice of Draftspe	ces Cited (PTO-892) rson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	Date			
	sure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	_) Notice of Informal) Other:	Patent Application			

Application/Control Number:

10/575,119 Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-17, drawn to method of prenatal diagnosing of chromosomal abnormality.

Group II, claim(s) 18-21, drawn to kit.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: PCT Rule 13.2 and 37 C.F.R. 1.475 define "special technical feature", as those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." 37 C.F.R. 1.475(d) states that, if multiple products, processes of manufacture, or uses are claimed, the first mentioned in the claims will be considered as the main invention, along with each of the other categories related thereto. The main invention is method of prenatal diagnosis using detection of chromosomal abnormality, which had been known in the art, for example, Saito et al.,cited in the IDS, therefore, no special technical feature exists for Group I as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, because it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Since the main invention lacks a "special technical feature," unity of invention is lacking and restriction is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number:

10/575,119 Art Unit: 1642

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Application/Control Number:

10/575,119 Art Unit: 1642

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MISOOK YU whose telephone number is 571-272-0839. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5:30 P.M., every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/575,119 Art Unit: 1642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MISOOK YU Primary Examiner Art Unit 1642

/Misook Yu/